

How and why to think about scattering in terms of wave packets instead of plane waves

Travis Norsen, Joshua Lande
Marlboro College
Marlboro, VT 05344

S. B. McKagan
JILA, University of Colorado and NIST
Boulder, CO, 80309

(Dated: August 15, 2008)

We discuss “the plane wave approximation” to quantum mechanical scattering using simple one-dimensional examples. The central points of the paper are that (a) plane waves should be thought of as infinitely wide wave packets, and (b) the calculations of reflection and transmission probabilities R and T in standard textbook presentations involve an approximation which is almost never discussed. We argue that it should be discussed explicitly, and that doing so provides a simple and intuitively revealing alternative way to derive and understand certain formulas. Using an under-appreciated exact expression for wave packet scattering probabilities, we calculate, for two standard examples, expressions for R and T for an incident Gaussian wave packet. Comparing these results to the corresponding ones calculated using the plane wave approximation helps illuminate the domain of applicability of that approximation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Scattering is arguably the most important topic in quantum physics. Virtually everything we know about the micro-structure of matter, we know from scattering experiments. And so the theoretical techniques involved in predicting and explaining the results of these experiments play a justifiably central role in quantum physics courses at all levels in the physics curriculum, from Modern Physics for sophomores through Quantum Field Theory for graduate students.

Given the importance of this topic, we should be particularly careful about clarifying its physical and conceptual foundations – both for ourselves and for our students. It is the main contention of this paper that these foundations are not typically as clear as they could be. The specific problem we address is the fact that the scattering particle is almost always described as a plane wave, rather than a physical, normalizable, finite-width wave packet. As we will explain in Section II, this standard plane wave account is fraught with conceptual problems, many of which have been documented to cause confusion and errors among students, and which may also cause confusion among experts.¹

In Section III, we present a simple alternative way of deriving the formulas for reflection and transmission coefficients for a step potential from a straightforward analysis of the kinematics of wave packets. We thus demonstrate that many of the conceptual problems associated with the plane wave analysis (as well as some pointless mathematical complications) can be quite simply avoided – all while preserving the mathematical simplicity and accessibility of the standard plane wave calculation.

In subsequent sections, we illustrate the relation between plane wave and wave packet treatments of scattering with two simple examples. In Section IV, we analyze

the scattering of a Gaussian packet from a step potential, using this to develop a more general exact expression for the reflection and transmission probabilities. For this example, we show that the exact probabilities can be expanded in powers of the inverse packet width, with the individual terms analytically calculable. We thus show explicitly that the usual plane wave expressions for R and T emerge in the limit of an infinitely-wide packet. In Section V we treat the reflection and transmission of a packet from a rectangular barrier and show that, in a certain limit, the plane wave treatment is not just slightly off, but instead badly misrepresents the qualitative behavior.

While the fact that the plane wave analysis is an approximation may appear obvious to some readers, textbooks often present the wave packet analysis (when they discuss it at all) as an afterthought – e.g., a more physically and conceptually realistic way of re-deriving the plane wave expressions for R and T .² This conveys the impression that the wave packet analysis is only a sort of heuristic, with the “really correct” plane wave results emerging when one takes the packet width to infinity. But this impression is both false and dangerous. The really correct probabilities are the ones based on the actual properties of incident particles, and these will always be properly represented as finite-width wave packets.

In many experimentally realizable situations, the packets are so wide (compared to other relevant length scales such as the de Broglie wavelength) that treating them as infinitely wide, i.e., as plane waves, is appropriate. Still, as a point of conceptual and pedagogical principle, it is the plane wave expressions which are an approximation to the wave packet probabilities, not vice versa. There is thus harmony between the mathematical and the conceptual: the thing that is properly regarded as fundamental (both conceptually and in terms of providing the rigor-

ously exact predictions for experiments) is wave packets. Hence our conclusion: it is in terms of wave packets that we should think about scattering ourselves, and introduce scattering to students.

II. THE PLANE WAVE ACCOUNT AND ITS PROBLEMS

Most students first encounter the quantum mechanical treatment of scattering with the simple example of a 1-D particle incident on a potential step:

$$V(x) = V_0 \theta(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } x < 0 \\ V_0 & \text{for } x > 0 \end{cases} . \quad (1)$$

We will base our discussion on this example, although most of what we have to say applies to scattering problems in general (including 3D problems, where R and T are replaced by the differential cross section).

The familiar calculation of R and T probabilities for the potential step follows, along with a discussion of the conceptual problems inherent in each step. One finds solutions to the time-independent Schrödinger equation

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \psi(x) + V(x) \psi(x) = E \psi(x) \quad (2)$$

valid on the two sides of the origin:

$$\psi_k(x) = \begin{cases} Ae^{ikx} + Be^{-ikx} & \text{for } x < 0 \\ Ce^{i\kappa x} + De^{-i\kappa x} & \text{for } x > 0 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where $k^2 = 2mE/\hbar^2$ and $\kappa^2 = k^2 - 2mV_0/\hbar^2$.

This derivation is already problematic for several reasons. First, rather than starting with an initial condition describing a real physical situation (e.g. a wave packet approaching the step with some definite width, position, and speed), we have started by finding the most general solution to the time-independent Schrodinger equation. We have chosen a specific general solution, namely writing ψ in terms of complex exponentials rather than sines and cosines, because we are already anticipating a particular type of initial condition, a plane wave approaching the step. In fact, this strategy muddles together the two steps, setting up the initial conditions and finding a solution, since it is difficult to write down this solution without already having a picture in mind of a plane wave approaching the barrier and being reflected and transmitted. Furthermore, because one has an even more specific set of initial conditions in mind, an incident wave approaching from the left rather than from the right, one quickly eliminates the D term, often with little or no comment.

While this analysis assumes a time-independent state, the choice of complex exponentials and the elimination of the D term are based on a certain intuitive physical picture that is inherently time-dependent: particles propagate in from the left, reflect or transmit at $x = 0$,

and subsequently propagate out to the left or right. The fact that the particles *propagate* suggests the complex exponentials, and the fact that particles can never be propagating to the left in the $x > 0$ region warrants setting $D = 0$. Rigorously speaking, though, Equation (3) (with $D = 0$) and the intuitive physical picture it is partially based on, are in conflict. For example, according to Equation (3), there is never a time when the particle was definitely incident from the left (and hence no real argument that it shouldn't be in the $x > 0$ region moving to the left).

Equation (3) solves Equation (2) at $x = 0$ only if ψ and ψ' are continuous there. Imposing these conditions gives the following familiar expressions relating the amplitudes of the incident, reflected, and scattered waves:

$$\frac{B}{A} = \frac{k - \kappa}{k + \kappa} \quad (4)$$

and

$$\frac{C}{A} = \frac{2k}{k + \kappa}. \quad (5)$$

Note that even writing down equations (4) and (5) requires recognizing that the value of A is an arbitrary initial condition (or overall normalization constant) which then sets the values of B and C . In working through this derivation with students, we have observed that while students have no trouble verifying that these equations are true, they are often baffled by why we choose to write them down in the first place. Writing these particular equations also anticipates an ultimate goal of deriving the reflection and transmission probabilities R and T , a goal which is often not obvious a priori to students.

Further, even when it is clarified that the goal is to derive R and T , it is not entirely clear how to proceed, unless one is already familiar with the derivation. According to the standard probability interpretation of the wave function, the reflection and transmission probabilities should be given by the area under the reflected and transmitted parts of $|\psi|^2$, respectively (assuming the area under the incident part of $|\psi|^2$ is unity). But since, with plane waves, all these areas are infinite, one can't calculate the reflection and transmission probabilities as one would naively expect. It is quite tempting (and quite wrong) to assume that the infinite widths simply cancel and that the reflection and transmission coefficients are given by:

$$R = |B|^2/|A|^2 \quad (6)$$

and

$$T = |C|^2/|A|^2. \quad (7)$$

We have observed that this is a common mistake for students to make, but most textbooks do not confront it directly. The actual R and T values are proportional not to the ratio of probability densities (associated with the

appropriate outgoing and incident part of the wave), but of the probability densities times the group velocities, or equivalently, times the wave numbers:

$$R = \frac{v_g(k)|B|^2}{v_g(k)|A|^2} = \frac{k|B|^2}{k|A|^2} = \frac{|B|^2}{|A|^2} = \left(\frac{k-\kappa}{k+\kappa}\right)^2 \quad (8)$$

and

$$T = \frac{v_g(\kappa)|C|^2}{v_g(k)|A|^2} = \frac{\kappa|C|^2}{k|A|^2} = \frac{4k\kappa}{(k+\kappa)^2}. \quad (9)$$

where $v_g(k) = \frac{d\omega(k)}{dk} = \frac{\hbar k}{m}$ and $\omega(k) = E(k)/\hbar = \hbar k^2/2m$. One can verify that $R + T = 1$.

Many textbooks simply write down Equations (8)-(9) without explanation^{2,3} – or worse – avoid them altogether by skipping the step potential and going straight to tunneling through a square barrier, using Equations (6)-(7) without mentioning that they happen to be correct only for the special case where the asymptotic wave numbers are equal on both sides of the barrier.^{4,5,6,7,8,9} Such approaches deliberately hide an important issue that should be confronted explicitly.

The vast majority of QM textbooks^{3,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17} justify Equations (8)-(9) by introducing the *probability current*

$$j = \frac{-i\hbar}{2m} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} - \psi \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial x} \right) \quad (10)$$

which describes the flow of quantum mechanical probability, as proved by the fact that the time-dependent Schrödinger equation entails the continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial j}{\partial x} = 0 \quad (11)$$

with $\rho = |\psi|^2$ the standard expression for probability density in the theory.

For a plane wave with $\psi = Ae^{ikx}$, Equation (10) gives the probability current:

$$j = \frac{\hbar k}{m} |A|^2 \quad (12)$$

which equals the probability density $|A|^2$ times the group velocity defined previously.

These textbooks state, usually with little explanation, that the reflection and transmission coefficients are given by the ratios of the individual probability currents for the reflected and transmitted terms to the incident current:

$$R = \frac{|j_R|}{j_I} \quad (13)$$

and

$$T = \frac{j_T}{j_I}. \quad (14)$$

where $j_I \sim k|A|^2$ is the probability current for the incident wave function $\psi_I = Ae^{ikx}$, and analogously $j_R \sim -k|B|^2$ and $j_T \sim \kappa|C|^2$.

Equations (13)-(14) and the resulting Equations (8)-(9) can be understood somewhat intuitively by arguing that if the incoming and transmitted waves are traveling at different speeds, then it makes sense that the amount transmitted should be proportional to the ratio of the speeds. However, it is difficult to make a rigorous, rather than hand-waving, argument for why, a priori, Equations (13)-(14) are the correct expressions for the reflection and transmission coefficients. (One textbook¹² justifies defining R and T in terms of probability fluxes by saying that it is done “by accepted convention” in order to ensure that $R + T = 1$!)

It is also difficult to intuitively relate the probability current approach to the interpretation of the probability as the integral of the probability density, $|\psi|^2$. Furthermore, it is not intuitively clear why the relevant speed is the group velocity, $d\omega/dk$, rather than the phase velocity, ω/k . In fact, if students investigate an animation of plane wave motion by writing a computer program or using a simulation,²³ only the phase velocity will be apparent to the eye. Furthermore, while the the group velocity of the transmitted wave is smaller than that of the incident wave, the phase velocity will actually be larger, so it is easy to develop incorrect intuitions based on the behavior of plane waves. Indeed, it is quite difficult to get an intuitive sense of the group velocity of a plane wave at all, unless one thinks of it as an infinitely wide wave packet, in which case one can imagine the group velocity as the speed with which this entire packet moves through space. In fact, thinking of very large wave packets seems to be the only way to gain an intuitive sense of plane waves at all – as we will argue in more detail subsequently.

Thus, although the ratio of probability currents gives the correct answer for the reflection and transmission probabilities for plane waves (as we will show in the next section by taking the limit of very wide wave packets), it is not particularly clear to students (or even to experts) why this should be. Moreover, probability current is a sophisticated concept, which is often introduced *solely* for the purpose of deriving R and T . Introducing such a concept in the middle of a derivation places extra cognitive load on students, increasing the likelihood that they will give up on understanding and just accept the results “on faith,” as magic formulas to be memorized and used without comprehension.

Further, the same fact that makes this detour into probability currents necessary – that we are dealing with unphysical plane wave states – can cause further conceptual difficulties, as shown by physics education research on this topic.¹

It is worth noting that some textbooks *do* discuss reflection and transmission of wave packets.^{2,3,4,8,10,11,12,13} (See also 18 and 19.) However, most start with plane waves and mention wave packets only as a qualitative afterthought, with little discussion of the meaning of plane waves or why they are used. Further, nearly all these textbooks contain pictures of wave packets whose width is not much larger than the average incident wavelength,

and therefore, as we will argue in Section III, are very badly approximated by plane waves. We know of only two textbooks that actually derive the probability of reflection for a wave packet in the limit that the width goes to infinity.^{2,10} However, even in these books, it is not intuitively clear *why* the mysterious factors of v_g or k should appear in Equation (9), nor is it clear that the final, plane wave expressions are approximations to the real wave packet expressions (rather than vice versa).

In summary, the analysis of 1-D scattering in terms of plane wave states, although mathematically simple, requires enough overhead and raises enough conceptual difficulties that the central physical lessons are significantly obscured. Wouldn't it be nice if there were some way of treating this topic that (a) didn't require the overhead of probability current and (b) forced students to think, from the very beginning, that we are really dealing with physical, normalizable *wave packets* to which the plane waves are merely a convenient *approximation*?

Such an approach will be outlined in the following section. In later sections we also present techniques for calculating and approximating R and T probabilities when the incident particle is represented by a gaussian wave packet. These techniques are probably too advanced for students in an introductory course. But our hope (and reason for including them here) is that they may help teachers of quantum physics to realize, fully and explicitly, that the plane wave formulas – e.g., Equations (8) and (9) – represent *approximations*, which is a necessary precondition of understanding under what conditions the approximation is valid. This perspective is clarifying, and may help repair and prevent the sorts of difficulties mentioned above.

III. SCATTERING PROBABILITIES AND PACKET WIDTHS




FIG. 1: A generic wave packet (with approximately-constant amplitude over most of its width, w_I) is incident on the step potential's scattering center at $x = 0$.

Consider a wave packet approaching the “scattering target” at $x = 0$ for the potential defined in Equation (1). Figure 1 is a diagram of this setup. Assume the packet has an almost-exactly constant amplitude (A) and wavelength ($\lambda_0 = 2\pi/k_0$) in the region (of width w_I) where the amplitude is non-vanishing, as shown in the Figure. Thus, where the amplitude is non-zero, the packet will be well-approximated by a plane wave:

$$\psi = A e^{ik_0 x}. \quad (15)$$

We may assume this incident packet is normalized, so that $w_I |A|^2 = 1$.

What happens as the packet approaches and then interacts with the potential step at $x = 0$? To begin with, the packet retains its overall shape as it approaches the scattering center (that is, we assume that the inevitable spreading of the wave packet is negligible on the relevant timescales). It simply moves at the group velocity corresponding to the central wave number for the region $x < 0$:

$$v_g^< = \frac{\hbar k_0}{m}. \quad (16)$$

We then divide the scattering process into three stages:

- The leading edge of the packet arrives at $x = 0$
- The constant-amplitude “middle” of the packet is arriving at $x = 0$
- The trailing edge of the packet arrives at $x = 0$

Suppose the leading edge arrives at time t_1 . Then the trailing edge will arrive at t_2 satisfying

$$t_2 - t_1 = w_I / v_g^< = w_I m / \hbar k_0. \quad (17)$$

For intermediate times, $t_1 < t < t_2$, we will have – in some (initially small, then bigger, then small again) region surrounding $x = 0$ – essentially the situation described in Equation (3), namely: a superposition of rightward- and leftward-directed plane waves (just to the left of $x = 0$) and a rightward-directed plane wave with a different wave number (to the right). And the same relations derived in the previous section for the relative amplitudes of these three pieces will still apply.

While crashing into the scattering center, the incident packet “spools out” waves – with amplitudes B and C given in Equations (4) and (5) – which propagate back to the left and onward to the right, respectively. These scattered waves will also be wave packets, with the leading edges of the reflected and transmitted packets formed at time t_1 and the trailing edges of the reflected and transmitted packets formed at time t_2 .

This gives a very simple and illuminating way to *derive* Equations (8) and (9). Consider first the reflected packet. The probability of reflection, R , is by definition just its total integrated probability density – which here will be its intensity $|B|^2$ times its width w_R . But the width

of the reflected packet will be the same as the width of the incident packet: because these two packets both propagate in the same region, they have the same group velocity, so the leading edge of the reflected packet will be a distance w_I to the left of $x = 0$ when the trailing edge of the reflected packet is formed. Thus, we have

$$R = w_R|B|^2 = w_I|B|^2 = \frac{|B|^2}{|A|^2} \quad (18)$$

where we have used the normalization condition for the incident packet $w_I|A|^2 = 1$.

Similarly, the total probability associated with the transmitted wave will be its intensity $|C|^2$ times its width w_T . But w_T will be *smaller* than w_I because the group velocity on the right is slower than on the left. In particular: the leading edge of the transmitted packet is created at t_1 ; the trailing edge is created at t_2 ; and between these two times the leading edge will be moving to the right at speed

$$v_g^> = \frac{\hbar\kappa_0}{m} \quad (19)$$

where $\kappa_0^2 = k_0^2 - 2mV_0/\hbar^2$ is the (central) wave number associated with the transmitted packet. Thus, the width of the transmitted packet – the distance between its leading and trailing edges – is

$$w_T = v_g^> (t_2 - t_1) = \frac{\kappa_0}{k_0} w_I \quad (20)$$

and so the transmission probability is

$$T = w_T|C|^2 = \frac{\kappa_0|C|^2}{k_0|A|^2} \quad (21)$$

in agreement with Equation (9).

To summarize, one can derive the usual plane wave expressions for R and T merely by considering the kinematics of wave packets, without ever mentioning probability current. In particular, the perhaps-puzzling factor of κ_0/k_0 in the expression for T has an intuitive and physically clear origin in the differing *widths* of the incident and transmitted packets, which in turn originates from the differing group velocities on the two sides.

This route to the important formulas is actually simpler than the one traditionally taken in introductory quantum texts: there is a clearly defined initial condition and a definite process occurring in time; probability only enters in the standard way (as an integral of the probability density $|\psi|^2$); and the two quantities needed to define the probabilities (the packet widths and amplitudes) are arrived at separately and cleanly.

This approach also has several virtues in addition to simplicity. First, with proper guidance, focusing on wave packets and a dynamical process in which something (namely scattering) actually happens in time can help students think about the physical process *physically* and/or to connect the mathematics up with real examples. Second, thinking in terms of wave packets can help

students recognize that the formulas developed above for reflection and transmission probabilities (and this point applies equally well to three-dimensional scattering situations) are *approximations* and to understand when those approximations do and do not apply.

In particular, the argument presented here suggests that the mathematical expressions for R and T above will apply only in the limit of very wide incident packets. This has several aspects. First, we are justified in neglecting the dynamical spreading of the wave packet (and hence, e.g., treating the reflected packet as having the same width as the incident packet) only if the speed of spreading is very small compared to the group velocity, that is, if $\Delta k \ll k_0$, where $\Delta k \sim 1/\Delta x \sim 1/w_I$ is the width of the incident packet in k -space. This implies that $w_I \gg \lambda_0$, in other words, that the width of the wave packet is much larger than the characteristic wavelength.

Second, the plane wave style derivation of the amplitudes assumes that, for some time interval (roughly, $t_1 < t < t_2$), the wave function's structure in some (variable) spatial region around $x = 0$ is indeed given by Equation (3). But these conditions will simply fail to apply if the actual wave function is (in the appropriate space and time regions) insufficiently plane wave-like, e.g., if the amplitude of the wave varies appreciably over a length scale $\lambda_0 = 2\pi/k_0$. Thus (assuming a smooth spatial envelope for the packet) the formulas will be valid in the limit $w_I \gg \lambda_0$, which is mathematically equivalent to the limit noted previously.

Third, the statements made above about the group velocities for the reflected and transmitted packets are not precisely true, because the reflected and transmitted packets need not be precisely centered (in k -space) about k_0 and κ_0 respectively. This is because the higher- k components of the incident packet are (typically) marginally more probable to transmit than the lower- k components (though the opposite behavior is also possible). Hence, the transmitted packet will (typically) peak around a value slightly greater than κ_0 , and the reflected packet will (typically) peak around a value slightly less than k_0 . These changes, however, will vanish for packets that have a narrow k -space distribution. (See Ref. 20 for an illuminating discussion of this “velocity effect.”)

Note finally that for a scattering center which has some finite width (e.g., a rectangular barrier), there is an additional length scale in the problem, and qualitative arguments also suggest that the plane wave type analysis should be valid only in the limit where the packet width is large compared to the spatial size of the scattering region: basically, the qualitative argument presented above (for the step potential, where scattering only occurs at $x = 0$) will go through unchanged so long as the width of the region where scattering occurs (e.g., the width of a rectangular barrier) is much smaller than the packet width.

Even students who are just encountering quantum mechanical scattering for the first time should be able to understand all of these points (with the exception maybe

of the third). That is, they should be able to understand how to think about scattering in terms of wave packets and how the standard textbook formulas (derived using plane waves) should be thought of as applying, as approximations, to wave packets that are wide compared to other length scales in the problem, e.g., λ_0 and the width of the scattering region. (The relevant length scale for the “velocity effect” mentioned above is the inverse of dT/dk , where $T(k)$ is the plane wave transmission probability for incident wave number k . Beginning students won’t understand that. But this point overlaps with the more intuitively obvious point about the scattering width, and so can be simply ignored.)

To help bring out more explicitly that the usual plane wave expressions are approximations, we include in the next two sections a more exact treatment of finite-width wave packets scattering from some typical textbook potentials.

IV. GAUSSIAN WAVE PACKET SCATTERING FROM A STEP POTENTIAL

It is possible to work out the *exact* R and T probabilities for a Gaussian wave packet incident on the potential step of Equation (1). Most of the derivation is worked out in several texts.^{2,10} But invariably these texts fail to write down the exact expressions for R and T and instead make last-minute approximations which result in the plane wave results developed previously. But it is worth pushing through the calculation to the end, if only to illustrate that the end exists and that the results reduces to the plane wave formulas *only in the appropriate limits*. Having the exact result in hand also allows one to analytically pick off explicit expressions for first non-vanishing corrections to the plane wave result, which is a great example calculation to share with students. That the corrections are small in precisely the limits discussed at the end of the previous section, is a nice confirmation of that discussion.

We begin with an incident Gaussian wave packet, with central wave number k_0 and width σ and centered, at $t = 0$, at $x = -a$:

$$\psi(x, 0) = (\pi\sigma^2)^{-1/4} e^{ik_0(x+a)} e^{-(x+a)^2/2\sigma^2} \quad (22)$$

We then follow Shankar’s text and proceed in four steps.

Step 1 is to find appropriately normalized energy eigenfunctions for the step potential. These may be parametrized by k and are (up to normalization) just the plane wave states given previously:

$$\psi_k(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left[\left(e^{ikx} + \frac{B}{A} e^{-ikx} \right) \theta(-x) + \frac{C}{A} e^{i\kappa x} \theta(x) \right] \quad (23)$$

where, as before, $\kappa^2 = k^2 - 2mV_0/\hbar^2$ and B/A and C/A are to be interpreted as the *functions of k* given by Equations (4) and (5).

The overall factor of $1/\sqrt{2\pi}$ out front is chosen so that

$$\int \psi_{k'}^*(x) \psi_k(x) dx = \delta(k - k'). \quad (24)$$

We are here assuming that only eigenstates with energy eigenvalues $E = \hbar^2 k^2/2m > V_0$ will be present in the Fourier decomposition of the incident packet and hence we make no explicit special provision for those ψ_k for which κ is imaginary. (For a more rigorous treatment see Ref. 21; the approximations we introduce here don’t change any of the central conclusions.) Note also that there are two linearly independent states for each E only one of which is included here. The orthogonal states will have incoming, rather than outgoing, plane waves for $x > 0$; such states will never enter given our initial conditions.

Step 2 is to write the incident packet as a linear combination of the ψ_k s:

$$\psi(x, 0) = \int \psi_k(x) \phi(k, 0) dk \quad (25)$$

where (assuming $\sigma \ll a$ so the amplitude of the incident packet vanishes for $x > 0$)

$$\phi(k, 0) = \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\pi} \right)^{1/4} e^{-(k-k_0)^2 \sigma^2/2} e^{ika} \quad (26)$$

turns out to be the ordinary Fourier Transform of $\psi(x, 0)$.

Step 3 is to write $\psi(x, t)$ by appending the time-dependent phase factor to each of the energy eigenstate components of $\psi(x, 0)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x, t) &= \int \psi_k(x) \phi(k, t) dk \\ &= \int \psi_k(x) \phi(k, 0) e^{-iE(k)t/\hbar} dk \\ &= \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{4\pi^3} \right)^{1/4} \int e^{\frac{-i\hbar k^2 t}{2m}} e^{\frac{-(k-k_0)^2 \sigma^2}{2}} e^{ika} \\ &\quad \times \left[e^{ikx} \theta(-x) + \left(\frac{B}{A} \right) e^{-ikx} \theta(-x) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{C}{A} \right) e^{i\kappa x} \theta(x) \right] dk. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

We can then finally – Step 4 – analyze the three terms for physical content. The first term, aside from the $\theta(-x)$, describes the incident Gaussian packet propagating to the right. For sufficiently large times (when the incident packet would have support exclusively in the region $x > 0$) the $\theta(-x)$ kills this term – i.e., the incident packet eventually vanishes.

The second and third terms describe the reflected and transmitted packets, respectively. If the factors (B/A) and (C/A) were constants, we would have Gaussian integrals which we could evaluate explicitly to get exact expressions for the reflected and transmitted packets –

which would themselves, in turn, be Gaussian wave packets which could be (squared and) integrated to get exact expressions for the R and T probabilities. However, these factors are functions of k . It is not unreasonable to treat them as roughly constant over the (remember, quite narrow) range of k where $\phi(k, 0)$ has support. This is the approach taken by Shankar (and, at least by implication, several other texts) and the result is precisely the plane wave expressions for R and T we developed earlier.

But another approach (which, surprisingly, we have not found in the literature) is also appealing. Consider the second and third terms of Equation (27) – which represent (for late times when these terms are non-vanishing) the reflected and transmitted packets. These can be massaged to have the overall form (again assuming t sufficiently large that the θ factors can be dropped)

$$\psi_{R/T}(x, t) = \int \frac{e^{ikx}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \phi_{R/T}(k, t) dk. \quad (28)$$

Putting the two terms in this form requires a change of variables – from k to $-k$ for the R term, and from k to $\sqrt{k^2 - 2mV_0/\hbar}$ for the T term. The resulting expressions for the k -space distributions of the reflected and transmitted packets are:

$$\phi_R(k, t) = \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\pi}\right)^{1/4} e^{\frac{i\hbar k^2 t}{2m}} e^{\frac{-(k+k_0)^2 \sigma^2}{2}} e^{-ika} \left(\frac{k+\kappa}{k-\kappa}\right) \quad (29)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_T(k, t) &= \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\pi}\right)^{1/4} e^{\frac{-i\hbar(k^2+2mV_0/\hbar)t}{2m}} e^{\frac{-(\sqrt{k^2+2mV_0/\hbar}-k_0)^2 \sigma^2}{2}} \\ &\times e^{ika} \left(\frac{2\sqrt{k^2+2mV_0/\hbar}}{\sqrt{k^2+2mV_0/\hbar}+k}\right) \frac{k}{\sqrt{k^2+2mV_0/\hbar}}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

To find the total probability associated with a given packet, we can just as well integrate the momentum-space wave functions as the position-space wave functions. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \int |\phi_R(k, t)|^2 dk \\ &= \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\pi}\right)^{1/2} \int e^{-(k+k_0)^2 \sigma^2} \left(\frac{k+\kappa}{k-\kappa}\right)^2 dk \\ &= \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\pi}\right)^{1/2} \int e^{-(k-k_0)^2 \sigma^2} \frac{|B|^2}{|A|^2} dk \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where in the last step we have done another change of variables from k to $-k$. This result can be summarized as follows:

$$R = \int P(k) R_k dk \quad (32)$$

where $P(k) = |\phi(k, 0)|^2$ is the probability density for a given k associated with the incident packet, and R_k is

simply the reflection probability for a particular value of k as expressed in Equation (8).

The analogous result for the T term emerges after some more convoluted algebra:

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \int |\phi_T(k, t)|^2 dk \\ &= \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\pi}\right)^{1/2} \int e^{-(\sqrt{k^2+2mV_0/\hbar}-k_0)^2 \sigma^2} \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{2\sqrt{k^2+2mV_0/\hbar}}{\sqrt{k^2+2mV_0/\hbar}+k}\right)^2 \frac{k^2}{k^2+2mV_0/\hbar} dk \\ &= \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\pi}\right)^{1/2} \int e^{-(k-k_0)^2 \sigma^2} \frac{|C|^2}{|A|^2} \frac{\kappa}{k} dk \\ &= \int P(k) T_k dk. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where in the next-to-last step we have made a change of variables (back!) from k to $\sqrt{k^2+2mV_0/\hbar}$.

These expressions are exact (subject to the assumptions noted earlier). Note that, if we treat $|B|^2/|A|^2$ and $(\kappa/k)|C|^2/|A|^2$ as constants that do not depend on k (i.e., if we approximate these functions by their values at $k = k_0$, which is a good approximation so long as the functions don't vary appreciably in a region of width $1/\sigma$ around k_0 , i.e., if the width σ of the incident packet is very big) we are left with plain Gaussian integrals that can be evaluated to get back the plane wave-approximation results we started with: $R = |B|^2/|A|^2$ evaluated at $k = k_0$, etc.

Unfortunately, the actual integrals are too messy to do exactly. But we can Taylor expand the $|B|^2/|A|^2$ and $(\kappa/k)|C|^2/|A|^2$ factors around $k = k_0$ to get a series of standard integrals, resulting in a power-series expansion (in inverse powers of the packet width w) for the exact R and T .

The first two non-vanishing terms for R and T are as follows:

$$R = \left(\frac{k_0 - \kappa_0}{k_0 + \kappa_0}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{2k_0}{\kappa_0^3} + \frac{8}{\kappa_0^2}\right) \left(\frac{k_0 - \kappa_0}{k_0 + \kappa_0}\right)^2 \frac{1}{\sigma^2} + \dots \quad (34)$$

and

$$T = \frac{4k_0\kappa_0}{(k_0 + \kappa_0)^2} - \left(\frac{2k_0}{\kappa_0^3} + \frac{8}{\kappa_0^2}\right) \left(\frac{k_0 - \kappa_0}{k_0 + \kappa_0}\right)^2 \frac{1}{\sigma^2} + \dots \quad (35)$$

We propose christening as “the plane wave approximation” the large- σ limit of these exact results.

Equations (32) and (33) hold more generally than just for Gaussian wave packets and step potentials. One can assume an arbitrary initial wave packet with k -space distribution $\phi(k, 0)$ and arbitrary potential function $V(x)$ (subject to the assumption that it is asymptotically constant on both sides of the scattering region), and still carry through the above derivation. One cannot say much in general about R_k and T_k for an arbitrary potential, but Equations (32) - (33) will still hold.

V. SCATTERING FROM A RECTANGULAR BARRIER

In the previous section we showed that, for scattering from a step potential, the standard textbook formulas are approximations which are increasingly correct as the width of the incident packet is taken to infinity. We now turn to a different example – scattering from a rectangular barrier – to show more explicitly something we claimed earlier: if the scattering region has a finite width that is not small compared to the width of the incident packet, the plane wave approximation will give badly misleading, qualitatively wrong results.

Consider the potential barrier given by

$$V(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x < 0 \\ V_0 & 0 \leq x \leq a \\ 0 & x > 0. \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

For a packet that is narrow compared to the barrier width a , but still wide enough that we can ignore its dynamical spreading during the time interval of the collision, there is an elegant kinematical argument that allows one to work out the total reflection and transmission probabilities. See Figure 2. Following the principle (sometimes attributed to Wheeler) of never calculating anything until one already knows the result, we sketch this argument first.

For this argument, and the calculations that follow, we make several assumptions. First, we assume that the barrier is much wider than the wave packet, that is, $a \gg w$ or $\Delta k \gg 1/a$, where $w \sim 1/\Delta k$ is the width of the packet. This approximation ensures that we can treat the interaction of the packet with each side of the barrier independently. Second, we assume that the wave packet is wide compared to its central wavelength $\lambda_0 = 2\pi/k_0$, that is, $w \gg \lambda_0$ or $k_0 \gg \Delta k$. This ensures that the packet does not spread out too much, and warrants making a plane wave approximation in treating the interaction of the packet with each edge of the barrier. Finally, we assume that $k_0 \gg \sqrt{2mV_0/\hbar^2}$, or $E \gg V_0$. This is not strictly necessary, but allows us to simplify the calculations by taking the reflection coefficient to be small.

Here’s the kinematical argument. When the packet arrives at the left side of the barrier, there is probability R_{k_0} for it to reflect, where the R_{k_0} here (and the T_{k_0} to follow) is the probability for reflection (transmission) *from a step*. The packet may also transmit, then reflect off the step on the far side of the barrier, then transmit back out to the left: this has overall probability $T_{k_0}R_{k_0}T_{k_0}$. Similarly, it could reflect 3, 5, or any higher odd number of times inside the barrier before finally leaving to the left. (Note that R_{k_0} and T_{k_0} are the same whether one is going “up” or “down” the step.) The total probability of reflection is equal to the sum of all these possibilities (which are non-interfering so long as the packet remains narrow




FIG. 2: The top frame shows $V(x)$ for the rectangular barrier. Subsequent frames show how $|\psi(x)|$ evolves in time for a wave packet incident from the left, through an infinite sequence of back-and-forth reflections inside the barrier. Note that the sizes of reflected packets are exaggerated relative to transmitted packets, compared to the assumptions made in the text.

compared to the distances between adjacent packets):

$$\begin{aligned} R_{k_0}^{(\text{total})} &= R_{k_0} + T_{k_0}R_{k_0}T_{k_0} + T_{k_0}R_{k_0}^3T_{k_0} + \dots \\ &= 2R_{k_0}/(1 + R_{k_0}) \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where we have summed a geometric series and used the fact that $R_{k_0} + T_{k_0} = 1$.

In the limit that $E \gg V_0$, we have $R_{k_0} \ll 1$, and Equation (37) reduces to

$$R_{k_0}^{(\text{total})} = 2R_{k_0}. \quad (38)$$

What happens if, instead of using this kinematical argument, we calculate the reflection probability in the standard textbook way – namely, using the energy eigenstates of the Schrödinger equation to read off the reflection probability according to Equation (6) (i.e., what we’ve called the “plane wave approximation”)? We will not repeat this calculation, as it can be found in many quantum mechanics textbooks,² but simply quote the result for the total reflection probability for a barrier potential:

$$R_{k_0}^{(\text{total})} = \frac{|B|^2}{|A|^2} = \frac{(k_0^2 - \kappa_0^2)^2 \sin^2(\kappa_0 a)}{4k_0^2 \kappa_0^2 + (k_0^2 - \kappa_0^2) \sin^2(\kappa_0 a)} \quad (39)$$

where A and B are the amplitudes of the incident and reflected plane waves, respectively. Rewriting in terms of the reflection and transmission coefficients for the step

potential, R_{k_0} and T_{k_0} , from Equations (8) and (9), gives:

$$R_{k_0}^{(\text{total})} = \frac{4R_{k_0} \sin^2(\kappa a)/T_{k_0}^2}{1 + 4R_{k_0} \sin^2(\kappa_0 a)/T_{k_0}^2}. \quad (40)$$

As before, because $R_{k_0} \ll 1$, we may simplify this to:

$$R_{k_0}^{(\text{total})} = 4R_{k_0} \sin^2(\kappa_0 a) \quad (41)$$

where, just to be clear, the left-hand-side refers to the overall reflection probability from the rectangular barrier and the R_{k_0} on the right hand side denotes the probability for reflection from a corresponding step potential, which is convenient since we want to compare with Equation (38).

This is the standard plane-wave approximation for the k_0 -dependent reflection probability from a rectangular barrier (for large E). Note in particular that – unlike the result of the kinematical argument sketched above – it oscillates rapidly back and forth between zero and $4R_{k_0}$ as k_0 varies, with a period of order $1/a$. So, if we believe the kinematical argument, we can already see a major qualitative disagreement between the reflection probability given by Equation (38), calculated using wave packets, and Equation (41), calculated from the plane-wave approximation.

The rigorous way to calculate the reflection probability for our wave packet is to use Equation (32). Part of the setup here was the assumption that the packet width was small compared to the width of the barrier, i.e., that Δk – the width of the packet in k -space – is large compared to $1/a$. This implies that the plane-wave result, Equation (41) will oscillate back and forth between its minimum and maximum values *many times* over the support of $P(k)$. And so the total reflection probability will simply be the average value of the plane-wave result:

$$R_{k_0}^{(\text{total})} = 2R_{k_0} \quad (42)$$

in agreement with Equation (38), the result of the kinematical argument.

Whereas the plane wave approximation predicts that the reflection probability rapidly oscillates between 0 and $4R_{k_0}$, the actual probability is just $2R_{k_0}$ – insensitive to the precise value of k_0 . (The related oscillatory behavior of R as the width of the barrier is varied is displayed in Figure 10 of Ref. 20, which treats scattering in terms of wave packets. However, this figure shows only barrier widths that are smaller than the packet width. Yet, interestingly, it is suggested by the figure that the oscillations disappear as the barrier width approaches the packet width, which is consistent with our claims here.)

In addition to showing how the plane-wave approximation can give qualitatively wrong results when it is applied inappropriately, this example helps illustrate the useful generality of Equation (32) for the reflection coefficient. As the earlier step potential example showed, this formula correctly predicts the behavior in situations where the incoming wave packet is wide compared to the

barrier (i.e., it reduces to the plane wave result in the appropriate limit). But as the rectangular barrier example shows, it also correctly predicts the behavior in situations where the incoming wave packet is small in comparison to some other length scale in the problem such that the plane wave approximation badly fails to capture the true, qualitative behavior of R .

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The standard introductory textbook presentations of quantum mechanical scattering are almost always in terms of unphysical plane wave states and (even in those texts which discuss wave packets) often convey the false impression that the plane wave formulas are correct, with wave packets serving only to illuminate the time-dependence of the scattering process. After reviewing some of the conceptual and mathematical problems which are given rise to by the unphysical plane wave states, we have argued that these problems can be largely avoided by instead deriving the basic expressions for reflection and transmission probabilities from a simple analysis of the kinematics of wave packets. The several (overlapping) approximations which enter into this analysis can be understood intuitively even by beginning students, which should help them understand that the R and T coefficients they encounter in textbooks (and homework problems) are approximations which are valid only in the limit of very wide packets.

To highlight the approximate nature of the standard plane wave results, we computed exact expressions for R and T for a Gaussian wave packet incident on a step potential. We showed that these can be written in the suggestive (and, as it turns out, general) form of Equations (32) - (33). In the limit of very wide packets, these reduce to the plane wave results; close to that limit, it is possible and illuminating to use these formulas to generate a power series in the inverse packet width.

We then briefly discussed reflection and transmission from a rectangular barrier, such that the packet width is large compared to the central wavelength, but small compared to the width of the barrier. We showed explicitly that the plane wave approximation badly misrepresents the dependence of R and T on the central packet wave number k_0 , whereas Equations (32) - (33) handle everything automatically and correctly.

In addition to the pedagogical value of introducing scattering in terms of wave packets from the very beginning, our main conclusion is the importance and fundamentality of Equations (32) - (33), which we have never seen in any quantum mechanics texts and have in fact seen only very rarely in the literature. (See, for example, 20 and 22 and references therein. Ref. 18 seems to mention the result in words without writing out the corresponding equations.)

It seems likely that the reason for this is that most physicists would regard these expressions as *obvious*. An

incident wave packet is, after all, merely a superposition of plane wave states with some associated wave number probability distribution $P(k)$, and the reflection and transmission probabilities R_k and T_k can be defined individually for those states. So it seems almost irresistible to conclude that Equations (32) - (33) should be the right expressions.

But we don't think it is so obvious. It cannot be so quickly taken for granted that "the reflection and transmission probabilities R_k and T_k can be defined" for the plane wave states. As we have discussed at length in Section II, standard derivations of R_k and T_k are really inconsistent, in that they presuppose a physical process that simply is not described by the posited mathemat-

ics. Simply put, plane waves do not reflect or transmit. Worse, they don't even exist. So the coefficients R_k and T_k are really only meaningful if thought of the way we've advocated here – as probabilities for the reflection and transmission of *very wide packets*.

In short, it is the plane wave expressions that presuppose wave packets, not vice versa. It is thus a mistake to think that Equations (32) - (33) are trivially derivable from more basic, independently well-defined things. If anything, it is a surprise that the probabilities can be written in this form. But they can, and this should be more widely known. As should the general perspective which gave rise to them: thinking about scattering in terms of wave packets.

-
- ¹ S. B. McKagan, K. K. Perkins, and C. E. Wieman, *A deeper look at student learning of quantum mechanics: the case of tunneling* (submitted to Phys. Rev. ST: PER), arXiv:physics/0802.3194.
- ² C. Cohen-Tannoudji, B. Diu, and F. Laloë, *Quantum Mechanics* (John Wiley, New York, 1977).
- ³ P. A. Tipler and R. A. Llewellyn, *Modern Physics* (W.H. Freeman and Company, New York, 2002), 4th ed.
- ⁴ D. J. Griffiths, *Quantum Mechanics* (Pearson, Upper Saddle River, 2005), 2nd ed.
- ⁵ J. R. Taylor, C. D. Zafiratos, and M. A. Dubson, *Modern Physics for Scientists and Engineers* (Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, 2004), 2nd ed.
- ⁶ K. Krane, *Modern Physics* (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1996), 2nd ed.
- ⁷ R. A. Serway, C. J. Moses, and C. A. Moyer, *Modern Physics* (Saunders College Publishing, 2005), 1st ed.
- ⁸ H. C. Ohanian, *Modern Physics* (Prentice, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1995), 2nd ed.
- ⁹ R. Knight, *Physics for Scientists and Engineers* (Pearson, San Francisco, 2004), 1st ed.
- ¹⁰ R. Shankar, *Principles of Quantum Mechanics* (Springer, 1994).
- ¹¹ A. P. French and E. F. Taylor, *An Introduction to Quantum Physics* (Norton, New York, 1978).
- ¹² R. Eisberg and R. Resnick, *Quantum Physics of Atoms, Molecules, Solids, Nuclei, and Particles* (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1985).
- ¹³ R. W. Robinett, *Quantum Mechanics; Classical Results, Modern Systems, and Visualized Examples* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1997).
- ¹⁴ A. Beiser, *Concepts of Modern Physics* (McGraw Hill, 2003), 6th ed.
- ¹⁵ R. Harris, *Nonclassical Physics* (Pearson, 1999), 1st ed.
- ¹⁶ L. D. Landau and L. M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics* (Elsevier, Oxford, 1977), 3rd ed.
- ¹⁷ A. Goswami, *Quantum Mechanics* (Wm. C. Brown, Dubuque, 1997), 2nd ed.
- ¹⁸ R. K. Hobbie "A simplified treatment of the quantum-mechanical scattering problem using wave packets", *Am. J. Phys.* **30**, 857 (1962).
- ¹⁹ W. E. Gettys "Potential scattering of a wave packet", *Am. J. Phys.* **33**, 485 (1965).
- ²⁰ M. H. Bramhall and B. M. Casper "Reflections on a wave packet approach to quantum mechanical barrier penetration", *Am. J. Phys.* **38**, 1136 (1970).
- ²¹ T. W. C.L. Hammer and V. Zidell "Time-dependent scattering of wave packets in one dimension", *Am. J. Phys.* **45**, 933 (1977).
- ²² J. L. Pedro L. Garrido, Sheldon Goldstein and R. Tumulka "Paradoxical reflection in quantum mechanics" (????), arXiv:quant-ph/0808.0610.
- ²³ See, for example, the PhET simulation *Quantum Tunneling and Wave Packets*: <http://phet.colorado.edu/simulations/sims.php?sim=tunneling>